

ASSASSINATION INQUIRY COMMITTEE
NEWSLETTER
vol.1, no.6

A NEW PHASE?

As we approach the 5th anniversary of John Kennedy's murder by cross-fire in Dallas (November 22, 1963), we are prompted to wonder if we are now entering a new, and possibly more fruitful, phase in our assassination inquiry. For the first time in five years, three things have taken place that could alter the whole situation.

First, the presidential election has finally taken place, and we are assured that as of the beginning of next year, the Johnson regime will no longer be in charge. If it is possible to say, as does Walter Lippman, that because Johnson got us involved in Viet Nam he cannot extricate us from Viet Nam, so it would seem possible to say that because Johnson got us involved in the Warren Commission cover-up he cannot extricate us from that cover-up. Maybe Nixon can.

Second, by the time of Nixon's inauguration, Sirhan's trial will most likely have begun. Ray's trial is now set for early March. The last shoe to drop would then be the first to have been removed-- the trial of Clay Shaw. The latter hinges on what course the Supreme Court decides to take. It seems probable that the high court will rule on the suit against prosecutor Jim Garrison but only after Chief Justice Earl Warren and possibly also Justice Abe Fortas have resigned to be replaced by Nixon appointees.

Third, the defense in the case of James Earl Ray is now allegedly claiming that Ray was no more than a decoy in a larger conspiracy. We would like to point out that we conjectured this was the case in our first AIC Newsletter (June 24, 1968). Harold Weisberg, moreover, has been claiming this since April. We feel that Ray's revelation is a significant new development. (See article on Ray in this Newsletter.)

P. S. Nichols

HAROLD WEISBERG DAZZLES SAN DIEGO WITH FOOTWORK AND FACTS

October 28 and 29 were fact-filled days for those who attended the combination speech-question-answer events at San Diego State College and the University of California at San Diego (sponsored by the AIC, the Experimental College at San Diego State, and Tuesday The Ninth Committee, UCSD), featuring noted Warren Report critic, Harold Weisberg. The attendance each evening was approximately 400. Weisberg also appeared on two local TV shows, both on KFMB-TV (CBS in San Diego), and participated on extended call-in sessions on radio stations KGB, KFMB, and KPRI. These appearances generated great enthusiasm and interest, involving audiences and studio staffs as well. Weisberg was repeatedly requested to revisit these shows on his next sojourn West, to answer numerous questions this time necessarily unasked due to time restrictions.

One of the topics with which Mr. Weisberg dealt in detail was the movement in New Orleans of individuals connected with the JFK assassination. He is particularly knowledgeable about events that transpired in New Orleans because of his own intensive investigation in that city and his close association with Jim Garrison. The following account furnishes excellent example.

The Los Angeles Free Press, on June 21, 1968, featured an article by Mark Lane asserting that "over a period of several weeks, two different emissaries had arrived in New Orleans. Each had sought out Jim Garrison; each stated that he was carrying a message from Robert Kennedy; each was known by Garrison to be associated with Robert Kennedy;

each carried almost the identical message; each said that Robert Kennedy did not believe the conclusions of the Warren Commission, and agreed with Garrison that a conspiracy had taken the life of President Kennedy." Lane went on to say that "the essential purpose of the visits was to 'reassure' Garrison that, despite his public utterances, Robert Kennedy very firmly held a different private view" regarding the credibility of the findings of the Warren Commission.

As Weisberg's familiarity with Garrison's investigation became apparent to his audience, one listener at San Diego State was prompted to ask Weisberg about the incident reported above. Relevant excerpts from Weisberg's reply are as follows:

"On about November 6 or 7, 1967, I was in New Orleans. Oswald In New Orleans had just appeared, and I was with Jim Garrison...He (Garrison) said that a man, one Charles Lind (spelled phonetically, ed.), who he knew to have been Bobby Kennedy's roommate in college, was in New Orleans, and while he did not know if Mr. Lind was going to see him or not, it was conceivable that Mr. Lind might, and on the chance that he was an emissary from Bobby, what in my opinion ought Jim to tell him? And up until this point Jim had had some pretty unkind things to say about Bobby Kennedy. Many of us had an opinion, that was an understatement of Garrison's, that Bobby was a little bit on the yellow side.

I suggested to Jim that in order to accomplish what all of us wanted to do, we could use every ally we had, that events could force Bobby to take a position, that he could not conceivably ultimately not agree with us, and that pending that day we should not make his lot more miserable. But the best thing to do was to leave him alone and let him work it out himself until such a time as he might conceivably come to us. That if he had to send a message, it might be that he understood the position Bobby was in, he was full of sorrow for Bobby's suffering, and that if there was anything he or I or any of those of us for whom he thought he might speak could do, we would be happy to help in any way. Jim agreed, and from that time on he never ever said an unkind thing about Bobby-- from that time until today...

On April 7 of this year I was in New Orleans investigating, and another man known to me-- a friend of mine, a friend of Garrison's-- in New Orleans on entirely other business, also a friend of Bobby's, called me. He said he wanted to talk to me. This was right after Bobby's speech at San Fernando Valley-- remember the speech? where he said he had seen everything in the National Archives, and that was a complete lie, and that nothing there was inconsistent with the Warren Report, and that is perhaps the most total lie in history, and that he endorsed the Warren Report, and that may have been true, I don't know. But in any event, Bobby never saw all that trash, trivia, and junk. He didn't try, and he didn't. I know now from Frank Mankiewicz, his press secretary, that he didn't even read any of the books. So I had a rather long and pointed, I guess you might call it "discussion", with this man, who I emphasize was not an emissary from Bobby, but was in New Orleans on other business...

The long and the short of it is this. He said that Bobby was buying time. He said that Bobby was afraid that there were already too many CIA guns between him and the Whitehouse. And he agreed with me that if Bobby were elected, his position would be untenable if a single unasked or unanswered question remained about his brother's murder...

I'll tell you the rest of it. On the 9th of June, I was asked to go to New York and speak at a rally for Bobby in Central Park, and I did. As you realize, that was four days after Bobby was killed. The

next day I called this man, who lives in New York, not in California, and we both recalled this New Orleans meeting. He said, 'I have to see you', and...we spent about three hours there (at dinner) and we were both pretty uncomfortable about it because this man knew that I had predicted Bobby's murder in a letter to your Speaker. Mr. Unruh, on January 17 of this year, saying that unless Bobby found his legs and became a man and spoke out, he would be assassinated. I regret that I was right. This man then told me (and the reason I say 'this man' is because he does not want his name used; I have asked him. I can understand his reason for not wanting his name used. I regret very much that the misuse of information has closed the mouths of too many of Bobby's people, some of whom might have helped us, and two of whom I was in touch with, and now they will not talk because they think that everything they say will be blabbed all over radio and television), this man then told me, 'It's worse than you know, because after I saw you I learned more.' Remember, he saw me in April. He said that three weeks before the assassination he had told Bobby's entourage that he had information an attempt would be made on Bobby's life in California and in a crowded environment. Because so much is out and because Bobby is now dead, I think it only right that I give you this much more of the rest of the story."

(We suggest that the reader compare the preceding account with Garrison's account of the same incidents, given during an interview with Art Kevin of KHJ News-Los Angeles, and transcribed in AIC Newsletter #1.)

We also note with interest that Harold Weisberg has been maintaining consistently that James Earl Ray was a "patsy" or "decoy" in the King assassination. It has recently been announced that Ray's defense will depict him as a decoy and the "dupe of a communist or possibly a Black Nationalist conspiracy." (Newsweek 11/11/68, p.92). More on Ray and K-2 appears in another article in this Newsletter. And more excerpts from Weisberg's addresses will be featured in forthcoming issues.

Diane Platt

RAY AS DECOY

Incredible as it may seem in this day of gun-barrel politics, one of the tragic assassination cases of the sixties- the one involving the murder of Martin Luther King in Memphis on April 4- almost came to trial this month. Why Ray suddenly changed lawyers at the last minute, thereby delaying the trial 90 days, remains to be seen. But it may have something to do with the fact that he is probably innocent and that in all likelihood he is telling the truth when he says he was merely playing the role of decoy in a larger conspiracy.

If you happened to catch page 16 of the LA Times on October 29, you know that, according to a news story on a Nashville paper, Ray's defense will claim that "Ray played only a small part in a master plot so complex and far-reaching that even Ray does not know who masterminded it...that he was promised \$12,000 to \$15,000 to lead police away from the real killers and become the lure in the greatest manhunt in history."

If this is true, as I believe it is, the strange bits of information that we have been getting over the last few months regarding the activities of James Earl Ray, alias Eric S. Galt, begin to make sense. The convenient abandonment of the rifle at the scene, allegedly replete with Ray's fingerprints, the witnesses who remember seeing Ray in the rooming house, the sighting of the white Mustang both at the scene of the crime in Memphis and later in Atlanta, the intricate maneuverings involved in obtaining a Canadian passport under a false identity in Toronto, the flights to London and Lisbon, the vast sums of money spent by Ray both before and after the

crime- all tend to support his claim that he was a paid decoy in a "master plot".

Hopefully, as the trial unfolds, the sequence of events in Ray's strange role will fall into place. But another source of information, which may prove to be more valuable to the American public than the trial itself, is William Bradford Huie's forthcoming book on Ray, which apparently will be serialized by Look magazine. In the first installment of Huie's account, which appears in the November 12 issue, we get some detailed information on Ray's activities, from the time of his escape from the Missouri State Penitentiary (April 23, 1967) until the end of his first sojourn in Canada (August 21, 1967). In addition to some interesting insights into Ray's character, Huie gives us the first clues as to how Ray may have first become involved in the plot to kill King. In Montreal, Ray apparently met a "blond Latin" named Raoul, who eventually made a deal with Ray involving Ray's receiving \$12,000 plus "living expenses" and a "suitable car" in return for Ray's undertaking certain activities including a trip to Birmingham, Alabama, where he was to wait "for instructions".

At the end of Huie's article is a Look tantalizer calculated to make one wait breathlessly for the next installment. It is a dark, silhouetted photograph of a doctor, "who until interviewed by Huie, did not know the man he treated was Ray". Undoubtedly this mystery doctor is a Hollywood plastic surgeon named Russell C. Hadley, who according to the LA Times (October 30) performed a minor operation on Ray sometime in March of this year. Perhaps the purpose was to make Ray a more effective decoy.

The big questions of course are (1) Will Ray be able to give any significant information concerning the people involved in the plot? (2) Will the plot turn out to be part of a larger conspiracy involving the murders of John and Robert Kennedy and perhaps even Malcolm X? Many people, such as New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison, are almost certain that this is so. One interesting clue in the Look article is Huie's statement that Raoul revealed to Ray that "he (Raoul) had spent some of his time in New Orleans, and he gave Ray a New Orleans telephone number."

If Ray knows anything, and if he is allowed to say all he knows, he could blow the whole thing wide open.

P. S. Nichols

REAGAN RULES TO FREE BRADLEY- DENIES EXTRADITION OF ACCUSED CONSPIRATOR AGAINST JFK NOVEMBER 8, 1968, SACRAMENTO

Governor Ronald Reagan became the first public official to free a man legally accused with the crime of unlawful conspiracy to assassinate President John F. Kennedy. The man is free without having had a trial to determine his guilt or innocence.

Last Friday, the Governor ruled to deny the State of Louisiana's request to extradite Edgar Eugene Bradley, of 12208 Emelita St., North Hollywood. The ruling came approximately 11 months after the indictment was filed by District Attorney Jim Garrison of New Orleans. Following the issuance of the "at large warrant" on December 20, 1967, an extradition request containing witnesses affidavits was approved by the Louisiana Attorney General, Jack P. Gremillion, and signed by Lt. Governor C.C. Aycock acting on behalf of John J. McKeithen, Governor of Louisiana.

Today Bradley is free. Governor Reagan's legal affairs secretary, Edwin Meese III (who handles all legal advisory for Reagan since the Governor's background is theatrical and not legal) ruled Bradley would not be sent to New Orleans to stand trial "based upon insufficient showing by Louisiana that Bradley had been in the state between August, 1963, and November 22, 1963", when the alleged conspiracy took place.

However, in this apparent last round of Bradley's fight to keep out of a New Orleans courtroom, confusion and conflicting reports abound. When Bradley presented affidavits at his extradition hearing on June 26th of this year, he claimed that at the time of the assassination he was in El Paso, Texas. This statement was widely reported. However, the Los Angeles Times report by Jerry Cohen, staff writer, last Saturday said, "Ever since Garrison's charge December 20, Bradley has steadfastly maintained that he had no knowledge of the assassination, knew none of the others implicated by Garrison, and was in his North Hollywood home on November 22, 1963, when Kennedy was assassinated in Dallas."

In a filmed interview broadcast on KABC-TV (November 8, 1968) on the Baxter Ward News, Bradley further confused the stability of his alibi when he said, "well,

I have numerous witnesses to verify that I was in Dallas, Texas, arriving at 12:55, just shortly after the assassination had taken place..." At another point in the interview he placed himself in El Paso. District Attorney Garrison has charged that Bradley was in Dallas at the time of the shooting.

In all fairness to Mr. Bradley these two reports were probably a combination of poor reporting by Mr. Cohen and a slip of the tongue by Bradley himself, but they serve to cast doubt on the validity of Governor Reagan's ruling that Bradley should not be extradited for trial. Without such a trial, such statements cannot be thoroughly examined. Adversary proceeding, the basic facet of jurisprudence which insures the probability of justice in American law, is forever absent in the case of the murder of President John Kennedy. This process allows for the counsel for the defense and prosecution to cross examine witnesses and evidence. Such debate is considered the most effective way to challenge and destroy falsehoods and uncover the truth. Since Bradley will not stand trial, we may never know what would have been the evidence in the Louisiana case against him. The evidence and the witnesses will not be subjected to adversary proceeding.

The Warren Commission refused to allow an attorney who was retained to represent the interests of the accused, to act as an adversary to the members of the Commission and their legal aides. The Commission, in summary, sought to determine Lee Harvey Oswald's guilt and acted in the role of prosecutor. The result was a biased and unfounded report, not truthfully reflective of the evidence. Most attorneys who are familiar with the Warren Commission's work, feel that the multitudinous inaccuracies in the Commission findings could never have resulted had they incorporated adversary ~~proceeding~~ proceeding.

Bradley's attorney, George Jensen, a former FBI agent, presented the Warren Report with other evidence in defense of Bradley at his extradition hearing. He based much of his argument on the findings of the Warren Commission that the accused Oswald was the lone assassin, and that there was no conspiracy. Jensen said that if California decided to extradite Bradley it would in effect be questioning "The Warren Commission, the FBI, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and all the investigative agencies of the US government."

Meese told Jensen and Bradley that the state's decision would not reflect on the Report. Meese further explained that the decision would be based on the "legal sufficiency" of the extradition papers from Louisiana.

In breaking down the case as it was evaluated by the Governor's office, the District Attorney presented affidavits of Roger Craig, a Dallas Deputy Sheriff at the time of the assassination and Max Gonzales, a New Orleans court clerk. In addition, Garrison stated in the request that his office had "other evidence" that Bradley discussed "in detail" with others, "measures to accomplish the assassination".

Former Deputy Sheriff Craig's sworn statement said that he positively identified Bradley as the man whom he had spoken to in front of the Texas School Book Depository just minutes after the shooting. Craig stated that Bradley "represented himself as a Secret Service man" as he mingled with Dallas Police at the murder site. Craig submitted a statement of other occurrences which he encountered to the Warren Commission. But the Commission dismissed his observations because they were not consistent with the Commission's own view of Oswald's movements just after the shooting. Craig had served as a Deputy for 8 years and had received the Man of the Year Award in 1960 for the capture of a most wanted criminal. The Sheriff of Dallas County, Bill Decker, later fired Craig when he requested permission to speak to CBS reporters at the time that network was making a four part documentary on the Warren Report.

The affidavit of Max Gonzales, submitted by the District Attorney, stated that Gonzales identified Bradley as having conferred at a lake-front airport in New Orleans, on different occasions between June 1 and August 31, 1963. He said that he observed Bradley talking with David W. Ferrer, one of those named by Garrison as a conspirator.

Bradley's attorney submitted a file of approximately 62 exhibits to show that Bradley was in California between June 1 and August 31, 1963, and also to support Bradley's contention that he was in El Paso, Texas, having just completed a bus trip from Tulsa during and after the time of the assassination.

The chronology appeared to prove Bradley's story, but without proper cross examination it is impossible to say how the exhibits would have held their credibility. For example, in attempting to support Bradley's story of his whereabouts between November 21 and 23, 1963, he offered a sworn deposition by himself that he had boarded a bus at 7:16 PM bound for Oklahoma City. He had, according to his deposition, visited a friend in Tulsa. He submitted a bus schedule as evidence of his trip. But the schedule would in no way link him to the bus trip and the deposition, since it is his own; it is not corroborative evidence but merely an explanation of that which he alleges he did, as against the charges.

On May 3, 1963, Mark Lane wrote in the Los Angeles Free Press about a letter which he had intercepted from the particular friend in Tulsa whom Bradley visited. Lane stated that Bradley had addressed a communication to the young woman in the form of an affidavit he had prepared for her to sign. "She was to swear", wrote Lane, "that Bradley had been with her in Tulsa, Oklahoma, on November 21 and November 22, 1963. He thus sought to have her offer an alibi for him on the day of the assassination. She refused to sign the affidavit, however, stating that it was false, as she had not seen him on November 22. Her daily diary, a copy of which I (Lane) have been able to secure, reveals that she saw Bradley on Nov. 20, 1963, and not on the 22nd."

Lane also told of another letter he had secured from the lady, in which Bradley had written to her some time after the assassination, but long before he had been indicted for conspiracy. In the letter Bradley admitted, according to Lane's article, that he knew "facts about the case that the public will never know about...You can be sure that Oswald was not the only one involved."

In a telephone interview with Charles Edwards, a free-lance reporter from UCLA, Bradley admitted having written the letter and saying "some of those things, which probably everyone has said at some time or another", but he added that Mark Lane had "twisted" the truth about some of the allegations.

Bradley's evidence at his hearing continued with a deposition by his aunt and another bus schedule. The aunt's deposition said that Bradley had telephoned her on Nov. 21, and told her that he was just passing through and wouldn't have time to visit her. Again a schedule is not evidence of having been on the bus, and the telephone call might have been made from anywhere in the country.

After that, Bradley said that he traveled all night on the bus to El Paso, where he arrived at 12:55 PM. There has been controversy about this point because Bradley said that he noticed the flags in El Paso to be at half-staff, and was told at the station that the President was dead. The controversy is about the time, because at 12:55 PM Dallas or Central Time, the President had not even been pronounced dead. This took place at 1:00 PM, Dallas Time, (see VOLUME XVII, page 3, Commission Exhibit 392 of the Hearings before the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy). The announcement to the press wasn't made until 1:36 PM, Dallas Time. Several almanacs list El Paso as being in the same time zone as Dallas, which would have made it impossible for Bradley's story to check out, but a check with weather bureaus and radio stations in El Paso reveals that the city is now, and was then on Mountain Time, one hour earlier than Dallas Central Time. Therefore, Bradley's story is not in conflict with what could have transpired on November 22, 1963.

Bradley submitted an affidavit of Rev. Hobart W. Bennett saying that he received a call from Bradley shortly after 12:55 PM when Bradley was to have arrived in El Paso. But the phone call which Rev. Bennett received does not prove Bradley's presence in that city. Thereafter, Bradley said that he went to the County Recorder where he conducted business for his employer, Dr. Carl McIntire. The business was regarding property, and Bradley submitted to the hearing records which bear his handwriting, according to another affidavit by his handwriting expert. In a trial, the handwriting expert would be cross-examined, and the records would be examined by the prosecution.

Bradley said that he stayed in a hotel in El Paso that night, and he submitted the hotel records showing his registration (El Paso's Knox Hotel, Room 207), as well as depositions from an employee and from the handwriting expert. He then traveled to Anthony, Texas, where he had more business, and offered as supporting evidence

affidavits of persons with whom he said he talked, and the bus tickets between Anthony and El Paso. In addition to the fact that in a trial this evidence would be challenged, even if it were established as legitimate evidence, it would not necessarily prove that Bradley could not have been in Dallas earlier that day, because Dallas is about 1½ hours by small plane to El Paso.

What should not go unnoticed about this point is that for Bradley's trip from El Paso to Anthony in the afternoon, he submitted actual bus tickets. But for the crucial trip from Tulsa to El Paso, during which time Kennedy was killed, Bradley submitted a bus schedule. The schedule is by no means a positive indication of his presence on the bus during this time- the time at which Garrison alleges he was in Dallas. None of the evidence presented was cross-examined by anyone at the extradition hearing, although the California Attorney General's Office was there to represent the interests of the State of Louisiana.

In another development in the case, which was brought to the attention of the Governor's office, Edwin Meese conferred with Loran Hall, who had been subpoenaed by Garrison as a material witness in the investigation of the President's assassination. Hall fought extradition and won, but after speaking with investigators from Garrison's office, he decided that he would go to New Orleans to testify. Hall had originally been afraid to go because of "all the crazy things" he had read about Garrison in the press. He cited the LA Times editorial of Dec. 28, 1967, which said, "No man, regardless of his background, should be railroaded to another jurisdiction simply to satisfy the whim of a headline hunting district attorney," and the editorial further termed Garrison's investigation "bizarre." The irresponsibility of that editorial had served to undermine the legal process to which Garrison adhered in his attempt to subpoena witnesses. The Times opinions were not unique amidst the antagonistic press coverage which Garrison usually receives.

Hall's conference with Meese was to convey his experiences to the Governor's office because of their relevance to Bradley's case. He told Meese of meetings which he had attended in Los Angeles in 1963, where he had delivered speeches regarding his anti-Castro activities, and sought the support of those present. Hall stated that Bradley had been present at at least one of the meetings, where the suggestion of assassinating the President had been discussed. "It was suggested", Hall said, "that we ought to get up an assassination team and go take care of Kennedy." Hall made it clear that neither he nor Bradley had made the suggestion, but that both had heard it. Hall stated that the meetings took place at the home of Clinton G. Wheat, also known as George Clinton Wheat, of 233 S. Lafayette Park Place, Los Angeles. Records show that Wheat had owned the home in 1963. FBI records revealed that Wheat had a police record and had been imprisoned in Louisiana in the 1940's for murder. Wheat was also the head of a California organization formed in 1962 by Ku Klux Klan Chairman, James R. Venable. Also present at that meeting, according to Hall, was Dr. Stanley L. Drennan, who now resides in the Hollywood area.

Drennan was investigated by the FBI for the Warren Commission in December, 1963. The FBI received a report from a Captain Robert K. Brown that he was present in Drennan's North Hollywood home when Drennan told him that "the National States Rights Party needed a group of young men to get rid of Kennedy, the Cabinet, and all members of the Americans for Democratic Action..." (See Hearings, Commission Exhibit #3063)

Bradley denied that he had attended the meeting with Hall or heard him speak, but said that he had attended a "Communism Lecture" there in "either August or July of 1963." Bradley said that he believed Hall was a liar and that Hall was conspiring with someone associated with Garrison.

After Hall testified in New Orleans, Garrison subpoenaed G. Clinton Wheat, on May 13, 1968. It was discovered that between the time that Hall had disclosed the 1963 meeting publicly and the date of the issuance of the subpoena for Wheat, Wheat had moved, his house then burned down, and Wheat himself then fled on foot from the mountain cabin when sheriff's deputies arrived to serve the subpoena. Wheat's wife first gave the Shasta County Sheriff's Captain Harold Cramer a phony name, but later admitted that she and her husband had been staying at the cabin. She said her husband had left the cabin walking, without luggage, a week earlier.

An article appeared in a LA newspaper, the North Valley Mail, written by C.M. Schoenkopf, stating that "a close personal acquaintance of Edgar Eugene Bradley" had revealed to that reporter that on the night of the assassination, Nov. 22, Bradley's wife called that acquaintance. The person's name was being withheld by the paper, but was known to DA Garrison. The article went on to say that Bradley's wife told the acquaintance that Bradley "had just called her from Dallas and mentioned during the phone call that he thought he was being followed. Bradley himself allegedly confirmed his presence in Dallas the day of the assassination to the acquaintance and to several other persons later."

On March 6, 1968, the North Valley Mail carried another article on the Bradley case, and this time the subject was a Garrison investigation witness, known to reporter Schoenkopf. The article described an incident in which the Garrison witness was the victim of a hit-run accident. The witnesses' name was again "being withheld for his protection...he was struck down after dark as he crossed a Valley street, by a speeding white car which had pulled away from the curb with lights out, according to reports." The article did not confirm that the witness was the same person as the one discussed in the first article; however, it did state that "the witness had been closely involved in the Eugene Bradley case."

Not long after Bradley's arrest, he submitted to a polygraph test in Beverly Hills. The test was given to him by Chris Gugas, a Beverly Hills criminologist. The result of the test, in the opinion of Gugas, was that Bradley answered all the questions truthfully. They showed that Bradley had answered such questions as: "Were you a part of a plot in any way to assassinate President John F. Kennedy? Have you ever piloted a plane by taking off or landing one at any time? Have you ever talked to Lee Oswald, Jack Ruby or David Ferrie?" To all of which questions, Bradley answered, "No." Although such a test is considered inadmissible as evidence in a trial, Bradley then challenged Garrison and his witnesses to take the same test. In his most recent statement, he said that he would be willing to take the same test again, even if administered by "the FBI or the LA Police Dept.", although at the time of the earlier test, Bradley's lawyer refused to allow those agencies to make such a test or to open up the record of his private test to the press.

On Saturday, November 9, 1968, Bradley said that he would seek felony indictments of those people he felt had conspired to "frame" him by giving false information to Garrison. He spoke on KABC's Marv Grey Show and told of someone "associated with Garrison" in the LA area who had made the statement, "I don't care if he is guilty or not, we will convict him on circumstantial evidence." This statement, according to Bradley, was tape recorded in a Hollywood bookstore, and Bradley claims he has a copy of the tape. Recently, Mark Lane made an appearance at the Pickwick Book Store in Hollywood, at which this reporter was present for the entire period, and never did I hear him make such a statement. In response to one of the questions asked him about Bradley, Lane did answer that he did not know if Bradley was guilty or not, but that he thought that a trial would be the best place for the determination to be made. However if Bradley alleges that Lane is the one who made the statement he referred to, it would be interesting to know if he could provide the tape recording in proof of his assertion. Lane has never seemed to be a man, in view of his 15 years of experience in criminal defense law, who could make such a statement; but this will remain to be seen when Bradley comes forth with the recording. There is a possibility that he was referring to someone else.

Whatever transpires, it would seem that the American people are further robbed of their right to know the truth about the murder of President Kennedy. Bradley, who has maintained his innocence from the beginning, will never have the pleasant feeling of having been acquitted by a jury of his peers; however, he has said that he is "very pleased" with the result as it is now.

Stephen Jaffe

BOOKS AVAILABLE AT BLUE DOOR

We are again pleased to inform our readers that the Blue Door Book Shop (3823 5th Avenue, San Diego; phone 298-8601) carries a complete line of books on the assassination. Your patronage of this fine establishment is greatly appreciated.

PRESS RELEASE, OCTOBER 31, 1968 (FROM THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY, PARISH OF ORLEANS)

A Grand Jury subpoena was issued today in connection with the investigation into the assassination of President Kennedy for the appearance of an out-of-state witness, Mr. Fred Lee Crisman from Tacoma, Washington.

Mr. Crisman has been engaged in undercover activity for a part of the industrial warfare complex for years. His cover is that of a "preacher" and a person "engaged in work to help gypsies."

Our information indicates that since the early 1960's he has made many trips to the New Orleans and Dallas areas in connection with his undercover work for that part of the warfare industry engaged in the manufacture of what is termed, in military language, a "hardware"-- meaning those weapons sold to the U.S. government which are uniquely large and expensive.

Mr. Crisman is a "former" employee of the Boeing Aircraft Company in the sense that one defendant in the case is a "former" employee of Lockheed Aircraft Company in Los Angeles. In intelligence terminology this ordinarily means that the connection still exists but that the "former employee" has moved into an underground operation. More often than not a "bad record" or evidence indicating that he has been "fired" is prepared for the parent company to increase the disassociation between the two.

Mr. Crisman is being called as a witness because our office has developed evidence indicating a relationship on his part to persons involved in the assassination of President John Kennedy.

For the information of the public, we want to reiterate that President Kennedy was murdered by elements of the industrial warfare complex working in concert with individuals in the United States government. At the time of his murder, President Kennedy was working to end the Cold War. By that time, however, the Cold War had become America's biggest business. The annual income of the defense industry was well over twenty billion dollars a year and there were forces in that industry and in the U.S. government which opposed the ending of the Cold War.

EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE COURSE ON THE ASSASSINATIONS, SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE

A unique opportunity is offered San Diegans to follow developments in the assassination questions when the San Diego State Experimental College's Assassination Inquiry Workshop convenes each Tuesday Night at 8PM in Conference Room C, Aztec Center. This Tuesday, November 19, Prescott Nichols will play a tape recorded study of the Malcolm X assassination, addressing the possibility of CIA involvement. A discussion of implications will follow. All interested are encouraged to attend.

RUSH TO JUDGEMENT	RUSH TO JUDGEMENT	RUSH TO JUDGEMENT	RUSH TO JUDGEMENT
RUSH TO JUDGEMENT	RUSH TO JUDGEMENT	RUSH TO JUDGEMENT	RUSH TO JUDGEMENT

RUSH TO JUDGEMENT, a documentary study of the Warren Report, will be shown in San Diego on Friday, November 22, the fifth anniversary of John Kennedy's execution in Dallas. The film, by Mark Lane, is a two-hour feature which effectively demolishes many of the contentions of the Warren Commission. The showing will be at 3pm, Friday, November 22, in Montezuma Hall, Aztec Center, San Diego State College. There is a 50¢ admission charge to cover costs of rental. Attendance is required at this event.

CLOSING NOTE

This Newsletter is being mailed First Class in the hope that the Post Office Department will forward it along to those of you who have moved, but have failed to inform us of your new address. Subsequent Newsletters will again be mailed at Bulk Rate, and will not be forwarded. Thus, if you have moved, you must inform us of your new address if you wish to receive future Newsletters. Please include your zip code with your new address, as well as your old address.

We wish to thank those of you who have submitted original articles for publication, as well as relevant clippings from periodicals. All are encouraged to contribute in this fashion and make the publication as strong as possible.

Finally, we again solicit monetary contributions to meet expenses. Those of you who have not yet contributed should seriously consider doing so, especially if the Newsletter provides a service for you. Please mail checks to:

ASSASSINATION INQUIRY COMMITTEE

4718 Saratoga Avenue
San Diego, California 92107

Editors of Newsletter: A. George Abbott, M.D.
Prescott S. Nichols
Stephen Pauley, M.D.
Jon Olson

November 15, 1968

*Mr. Harold Winkler
Route 7
Frederick, Maryland
21701*



ZIP CODE

ALWAYS USE

ASSASSINATION INQUIRY COMMITTEE
4718 SARATOGA AVENUE
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92107